

SR-35 Columbia River Crossing Feasibility Study



SR-35 Corridor Screening

| Criteria: Potential to conflict with the following purposes for the project | Corridors | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| | West | City Center | Existing Low | Existing High | East A | East B | No Action |
| Improve cross-river multi-modal transportation while adequately accommodating river navigation | ● | ◐* | ○* | ● | ◐ | ● | ● |
| Minimize impacts to the natural, built, and aesthetic environment | ● | ◐* | ◐* | ● | ● | ● | NA |
| Minimize impacts to recreation activities | ● | ●* | ○* | ○ | ● | ● | ○ |
| Minimize impacts to cultural and historical resources | ● | ◐ | ◐** | ◐ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Be financially acceptable and support local economic development | ● | ● | ◐ | ● | ◐ | ● | ◐ |
| Maintain the integrity of the interstate highway system | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● | ● | ○ |
| Should the corridor be considered further in the project development? | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |

● = High conflict; ◐ = Moderate conflict; ○ = Low conflict; NA = Not applicable

*Conflicts would be less for a tunnel facility option

**Conflicts would be higher for a tunnel facility option

Summary

West Corridor: Recommended to be eliminated from further consideration due to high impacts associated with most criteria, including potential impacts associated with the environment.

City Center Corridor: Recommended to be carried forward for further consideration. It is noted that potential impacts to recreation, especially to water-based activities, may be high and potential impacts to the environment may be moderate.

Existing Low Corridor: Recommended to be carried forward for further consideration due to this corridor having fewer potential impacts relative to the other corridors.

Existing High Corridor: Recommended to be eliminated from further consideration due to potential high impacts to the environment combined with a high/moderate conflict with the transportation purpose for the project.

East A Corridor: Recommended to be carried forward for further consideration. It is noted that potential impacts to recreation, especially to land-based activities, may be high; potential impacts to the environment may be moderate; and, connection to the interstate system may require a new access point.

East B Corridor: Recommended to be eliminated from further consideration due to high impacts associated with most criteria, including potential impacts associated with the environment.

No Action Alternative: Recommended to be carried forward throughout project development as required by NEPA.

SR-35 Columbia River Crossing Feasibility Study



SR-35 Corridor Detailed Screening

| Criteria: Potential to conflict with the following purposes for the project | Corridors | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| | West | City Center | Existing Low | Existing High | East A | East B | No Action |
| Improve cross-river multi-modal transportation while adequately accommodating river navigation | ● | ◐* | ○* | ● | ◐ | ● | ● |
| Vehicle miles traveled | ● | ◐ | ○ | ◐ | ◐ | ● | ○ |
| Bicycle and pedestrian mobility | ● | ◐ | ○ | ● | ◐ | ● | ● |
| Commercial goods mobility | ● | ◐ | ○ | ● | ◐ | ● | ◐ |
| Accommodate river navigation | ◐ | ◐* | ◐* | ◐ | ◐ | ◐ | ● |
| Minimize impacts to the natural, built, and aesthetic environment | ● | ◐* | ◐* | ● | ● | ● | NA |
| Federally listed fish threatened and endangered species and habitat | ● | ●* | ●* | ● | ● | ● | NA |
| Federally listed non-fish threatened and endangered species and habitat (e.g. bald eagle) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● | ● | NA |
| Other species and habitat | ◐ | ◐ | ◐ | ◐ | ● | ◐ | NA |
| Visual and aesthetics | ● | ◐* | ◐* | ● | ● | ● | ◐ |
| Land use consistency | ● | ◐ | ○ | ● | ◐ | ● | ○ |
| Minimize impacts to recreation activities | ● | ●* | ○* | ○ | ● | ● | ○ |
| Water-based recreation | ● | ●* | ◐* | ○ | ◐ | ● | ◐ |
| Land-based recreation | ◐ | ◐* | ○ | ○ | ● | ● | ○ |
| Minimize impacts to cultural and historical resources | ● | ◐ | ◐** | ◐ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Be financially acceptable and support local economic development | ● | ● | ◐ | ● | ◐ | ● | ◐ |
| Cost of project | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Impacts to local business | ● | ● | ◐ | ● | ◐ | ● | ◐ |
| Maintain the integrity of the interstate highway system | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● | ● | ○ |
| Should the corridor be considered further in the project development? | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |

● = High conflict; ◐ = Moderate conflict; ○ = Low conflict; NA = Not applicable

*Conflicts would be less for a tunnel facility option

**Conflicts would be higher for a tunnel facility option